ADULT EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN
EDUCATION

NEW REFLECTIONS ON A LEARNING SOCIETY

A Response to the Report: Continuing

Education: The Third System

Published by the Ministry of Education

Government of Ontario, Toronto, 1981

An Informal Publication of the
Department of Adult Education
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West,
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6

Alan M. Thomas, Diana J. Ironside, David S. Abbey, James A. Draper,
Donald H. Brundage, Ann W. Fales, J. Roby Kidd

Preface

We believe that most of the basic instruments for the support and development of "continuing education" in Ontario are in place. But their present existence, their present relationships will not allow for the smooth and successful attainment of existing and future learning and educational objectives.

What is needed is an inclusive and comprehensive unifying concept, and a strategy arising from that concept that will provide for the continuous adjustment of individual and collective aspirations and goals.

The present Report does not provide for such a concept, but instead reflects an existing tradition in this Province of segregating education in vertical layers. It is time to break free from that tradition which, in a period of rapid change, can no longer provide a basis for thinking coherently about education. Contradictions in the Report itself indicate the already exceeded limits of the conceptual organization it proposes.

It is our opinion that we must begin with "learning" and the multitude of objectives with which this precious capacity must be associated, and examine anew our educational activities and organizations, rather than the other way around. It is to this end that this Response is directed.

Recommendations

1. A new and more inclusive organizing concept is needed for the Province of Ontario.
2. Attention must be directed to the elaboration and clarification of a Strategy for Learning of the Government of Ontario. Such a strategy will involve the majority of the activities of the Government. In the light of such a strategy, policy devoted specifically to education will fall into its proper perspective.
3. An Ontario Council for Education, including public and private representatives, should be created with the following major responsibilities:
   i. to provide information throughout the Province on all educational opportunities, of a long and short-term nature; and
   ii. to provide a public review, annually, of the degree to which the established educational objectives of the Province are being met.

Introduction

The report is a welcome contribution to a long overdue debate. Those of us working in the field of adult education have, for some time, been aware of the need for public discussion and the reformulation of educational policy in the Province of Ontario.[1] We have also noted the emergence of such discussion and policy formation in other Canadian provinces; some, for example the Province of Quebec, on a much larger scale. We refer to the matter of scale because it is our view that however modestly the enterprise may be perceived to be in this Province, the issues to which it is devoted are already changing the basic shape of education in Ontario, including all of the "formal" agencies. Any policy emerging from a discussion of these issues will necessarily involve a scope and grandeur sufficient to reflect these changes. We are, therefore, devoting our commentary to the development of a conceptual frame for the emergence of such a policy or policies.

Throughout its argument, the Report properly reflects the enormous range of individuals and agencies, of programs, financial arrangements, learning objectives, and learning patterns involved in the practice of education in Ontario. Everywhere there is evidence of amended programs and requirements, of adapted facilities and periods of accessibility, of enormously complicated financial arrangements, and of an amazing variety of patterns of study. All of these changes are the result of one single phenomenon: the movement into self-conscious learning and, for many, into education, by individuals who for the most part have not been considered significant learners or important students in the past. Our basic agencies of formal education have not been designed for these individuals. As a result, while a relentless process of adaptation is taking place, it is clear that we are not meeting the demand; a demand made up jointly of the collective needs of the Province expressed in terms of employable skills, responsible citizenship, and advanced technical, scientific, and managerial abilities; and the legitimate aspirations of each one of our citizens to realize

---

1 See various briefs and reports to the Royal Commission on Declining Enrolment in Ontario

Davie, L.E. Educational Needs & Learning Conditions of Adult Learners
Thomas, A.M. and Davie, L.E. Challenge and Change
Thomas, A.M., Holland, J., McLeod, E., Keating, D. A Functional Definition of Continuing Education for Boards of Education in Ontario

his or her potential as fully as possible. All "states" have always faced such problems, but never have they expressed themselves in terms of the need for, and potential of, individual learning, as cogently as today.

The Report makes exceedingly clear that the existing complexity of education in Ontario, at least at the level of organization, is both natural and unavoidable. To meet the twin goals of social and individual satisfaction, it will not be possible to revert to, or impose, simple methods of organization and administration that may have worked in the past when goals associated with learning were simpler and more limited. The Report does not recommend the creation of increased numbers of familiar institutions, or new types of institutions, on a large scale; nor does it recommend the dismantling of any existing institution, though the significance of the issues involved could have led to such recommendations. It does, however, indicate that the relationships between those institutions themselves, between them and the potential and actual learner, and between them and the goals of the Province, are unclear, unnecessarily complicated, insufficiently influenceable and influenced by learners, and too limited to meet the demonstrated needs. The Report contends that what is needed is a new basis for those relationships, indeed a new concept that will allow both government and citizens to understand and utilize more effectively the educational resources already at their disposal. The Report proposes the acknowledgement of a "Third System" of education in Ontario, in addition to the two others: elementary and secondary, and post-secondary. The Third System is to be entitled "Continuing Education" and is defined, for the purposes of the Report, as "the provision of opportunities for lifelong learning in English and in French to adult learners who are not involved in full-time credit programs. Adult learners are those people at least sixteen years of age or older who are engaged in purposeful learning activities." (page 7)

The Irrelevant Concept of Age

While we agree that a new and more inclusive organizing concept is needed, we cannot accept the concept offered by the Report as sufficient to meet the need. In fact, we believe that to accept the concept, as distinct from the term "continuing education", will make things worse since it is, in effect, another example of grafting a new complication onto an already over-complicated system(s), the very procedure which already bedevils the status-quo. Indeed,

we believe that by the end of the Report, the authors themselves have become sceptical of the validity and usefulness of the proposed definition, since it involves so many discrepancies in application. To be obliged to take seriously whether someone is an adult at the age of 16, or 18, or 14 (all those ages have, in the past, been used for such a definition for some purpose), or to enquire as to whether part-time students should be included in continuing education or not, are simply two examples of the limited use to which the concept, as defined, can be put.

There are many valuable clarifications and implied recommendations in the Report, but despite their cogent good sense they stand alone and will probably be unaccepted without a functional, unifying concept for support. What is proposed is not functional, and does not even reflect present realities.

The history of educational policy-making in the Province of Ontario, since the Second World War, has been one of examining the system on the basis of "vertical" segments. Such reports as:

> The Royal Commission on Education (The Hope Commission) 1950
>
> Living and Learning: Report of the Commission on Elementary and Secondary Education, Provincial Commission on Aims and Objectives of Education in The Schools in Ontario, Newton Publishing Company 1968
>
> The Learning Society: Report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education, Ministry of Government Services 1972
>
> Final Report of the Select Committee of the Ontario Legislature on the Untilization of Educational Resources 1975
>
> Secondary Education Review Panel, Discussion Paper, May 1981

With the single exception of the Final Report of the Select Committee of the Ontario Legislature, all of the other bodies were entrusted with the analysis of one vertical slice of the education system, with the result that concern for the other steps in the system, indeed a concern for "continuity" remained only a marginal matter in each of the studies. An organizational and political manifestation of this perspective was to be found in the creation of two separate Ministries for each of the then principal sectors of education, a situation the Government has since corrected. To be sure, each of these bodies tried to deal with the horizontal integration of their "slices" with other complementary sources of learning in the society, and with other non-educational activities such as employment, leisure, and family-life. Some concern was shown for opening

up each of the levels of education to easier multiple access; that is, to forms of "interrupted" education, but without the freedom to deal with the powerful demands of vertical progress through the system(s), little could be achieved.

In our opinion, the present Report is heir to this perspective, accepting the legitimacy of the administrative perspective of the past thirty years and, for that reason, offers a concept of continuing education that is only an additional vertical slice tacked onto the outside of the administrative and organizational status quo. The concept as defined denies the essential meaning of its own language. A procedure that applies only after some arbitrary point in the life of the learner, or when some particular point in the system itself is reached (such as the end of compulsory attendance or the end of uninterrupted participation in the system at the point of high school or university graduation) can scarcely be termed "continuing". The concept, as proposed, also denies the experience of the learner. Whether I am pursuing the final years of high school, or whether I am attending high school, or college, or university, part-time or full-time as a mature student, in my eyes I am continuing my education voluntarily. The essential matter for me is the degree to which I can preserve sufficient continuity in my life by means of access to educational resources in a sufficient variety of ways; part-time, full-time, concurrent, consecutive ways of participating.

It makes no sense at all to be obliged by this perspective to debate at which precise age an individual becomes an adult in this society. While this issue is of some legal significance with respect to driving an automobile, drinking in public places, liability for military service, attending restricted films, or voting (many of which are allowed at different ages), it can not be a consideration for educators. The aim of education is to assist individuals to mature; that is, to become adults, and to engage in and enjoy adult behaviour as loosely determined by the canons of the society and the traditions of our civilization. The reality of learning and education in this sense is that such maturation is a slow, gradual, and never-completed process with, except for the pre-pubescent, little relationship to chronological age. While sixteen years may be the legal age of freedom from compulsory attendance, a determination of social, economic and political convenience, it has nothing to do with a proper concept of continuing education.

The Tumult of Definitions

The Report properly points out the many terms in use that cluster about

the concept of continuing education. Of even greater significance is the observation that the term "continuing education" has several operative meanings within the administration of education in Ontario. In 1976, the then Minister of Education froze grants for "continuing education" to School Boards, because even within that sector, the term was subject to so many definitions as to be virtually useless for financial or administrative purposes. The Report tries to sort out some of the international terms: Recurrent Education, Life-Long Education, etc., accurately identifying their sources, and some of the special biases they reflect. No one can deny that there has been a luxuriance of vocabulary with respect to adult education in the past three decades, partly attributable to the rapid growth of the field, the multiplicity of sources of commentary and analysis, and some academic "imperialism". In addition, all of us have been imprecise in our use of the terms, and the official clarification of the Report is welcome. However, the Report adds its own difficulties by appearing to interchange such terms as life-long education, life-long learning, and continuing education, without the same attention to clarity observed in its opening pages. We submit that the opportunity provided by the Report and the accompanying debate is precisely an opportunity to achieve some greater clarity in language and concept, with a resulting benefit for the organization and practice of all education in the Province of Ontario.

To conclude this section, we refer to the statement of the Minister of Education, included in the Report (Appendix C, page 110):

> Education is however, a continuum, and these goals apply (in appropriately modified form) to all the steps of learning, whether in the schools, the Colleges, the universities, and the workplace. The goals of education flow from the image of the learner for whom the education is being provided. The image of the learner relies as much on the process as on the content of learning, because it is through the process that young people become life-long learners who have, as C.P. Snow says, 'the future in their bones as well as the past in their heads'. The enquiring mind and the contemplative spirit can carry our life-long learners into the uncertain future with confidence, resourcefulness and integrity. In Ontario we believe we have and will continue to provide through the publicly-supported educational system at all levels <u>equal</u> educational opportunity for all.

With some reservations about the degree to which, in fact, Ontario has and does provide equal opportunity for all, and with the substitution of "all people" for "young people", it is our conviction that the Minister's statement goes beyond the

proposals and the perspective of this Report, reflecting a system of education in Ontario that has grown beyond the basic perspective of the Report. A new organizing perspective is needed. We believe that it is our responsibility to elaborate such a new perspective.

The Need for a Strategy of Learning

Learning is an activity in which living, individual, organisms engage. Learning is to education as physics is to engineering. All educational systems must be responsive to, as the Minister suggests, "the image of the learner". It is the lack of this responsiveness and misconstruction of that image which is the principal failure of the Report, and the principal problem in education in Ontario. In any society, at any time, the task of maintaining a satisfactory, instrumental image of the learner is a profound and continuing challenge. At its heart, this is what this debate is about.

All individuals, to varying degrees, engage in learning throughout their entire lives. In less mobilized, less interdependent societies of the past, the State needed only to be concerned with formal learning, socialization, for the many early in their lives, if it was concerned at all. All States have been concerned with the learning of an elite few needed for the maintenance of the State itself.

Today, demands are being placed on the learning potential of many more individuals. It is already a platitude to observe that our survival as a society and a state depends upon the willingness of enormous numbers of individuals to learn, not only as children, but equally as adults. At the same time, the opportunities for learning have multiplied beyond the imaginations of citizens of even fifty years ago. Educational agencies no longer have a monopoly on information, old and new, nor on the learning that takes place in the society. It is arguable that the reason why the use of educational resources is so concentrated among those in the more privileged groups is precisely because they are more relentlessly exposed to both the demand and the opportunity to learn. Resources for learning, or education, are not distributed evenly in this or any other industrial society.

Any State must cope with the potential and actual learning amongst its citizens. It must permit or suppress certain results of learning and, in addition,

it must decide continuously what learning objectives it will encourage, and what learning objectives it will direct. Above all, it must win, it must deserve, the voluntary commitment of its citizens to learn the attitudes, the skills, the sensitivities, that it believes will contribute both to their individual benefit and the survival and well-being of the State. Learning is the manifestation of an "appetite for the future" which the Report and the Minister take so seriously.

One response to the capacity for learning is education, with which we and the Report are primarily concerned. But all educational endeavour, all educational agencies, must float in a sea of learning, which is one aspect of what the Minister means by "the image of the learner", and must adjust themselves accordingly to the winds, tides, currents, and depths of that sea.

Any educational system must adjust itself therefore to what is being learned elsewhere, what is being learned concurrently by individuals participating as students, and what will be learned subsequent to that participation. An educational system cannot control that learning (though often it shows signs of wishing to do so), but it can respond to it, shape it, and enlarge it.

Primarily, a State must have a strategy for learning, into which its educational policies must fall. That strategy must either prohibit, permit, encourage, or direct learning. In permitting learning, the State simply does not interfere with it, as it currently interferes with learning associated with the non-medical use of drugs, or learning associated with certain cults and semi-religious groups. In encouraging learning, the State may provide resources in the form of art galleries, museums, wilderness preserves, educational television systems, and the like. It may go even further in encouraging learning, as does the Federal Government in making financial assistance available to labour organizations, or businesses, or individuals, to promote and assist learning determined by those organizations. In directing learning, the State resorts to education.

A strategy for learning which may include placing a value on the existence of such organizations and the learning they pursue, is then an overall strategy which involves not simply a Ministry of Education, but an entire government. It has within it the more explicit strategy governing the directions of the educational system.

We believe that this perspective allows the emergence of policies which relate the non-educational agencies that support and encourage learning in Ontario to the educational endeavour, more clearly and efficiently than that contained in the Report. The question that flows from this argument then is: What is the learning strategy of the Government of Ontario, and how may it best be formulated and evolved within the present organization of government?

Until this fundamental question is addressed, and an answer found, we will be unable to be truly rational about our educational system.

A Proposed Strategy for Learning

In contrast to the definition set out in the Report, we would argue that education is indeed a continuum, and that an educational system as a whole, in the present period, must be perceived in its entirety as a system[2] or perhsps systems of continuing education.

For us then, an adequate definition of continuing education is as follows: It is a system(s) of education which includes formal and non-formal education, that is defined with respect to its various parts and agencies (elementary schools, secondary schools, colleges, and universities, for example) in terms of specific educational objectives to be fostered, rather than in terms of the ages or circumstances of learners. The system is available to persons of any age, part-time or full-time, voluntary or compulsory, and is financed by a mixture of private and public resources. It is distinguished from other educational activities in the society by the possession of the exclusive right to provide public recognition or certification for those completing its programs, though not all of its programs need lead to such certification.[3]

We believe that this definition provides a simplicity and ease of application that the definition contained in the Report lacks, and that it reflects the experience and the basic need for continuity of the learners.

---

2 There is some uneasiness about the use of the term "system" among Adult Educators. In this context the term means "a complex whole, a set of interconnected things or parts, a group of bodies moving about one another under some dynamic law." (Oxford English Dictionary)

3 While we are arguing for this definition, our primary interest remains focussed on those individuals who participate voluntarily in the system.

There is, in our opinion, no contradiction in part of the system being compulsory, and the bulk of it voluntary. Nor do we see any contradiction in those responsible for the achievement of elementary objectives being responsible for the provision of those opportunities for individuals of any age. The Report points out that, "In content basic education for adults does not vary appreciably from basic education for the young" (page 36). While we agree entirely with the Report that teachers trained to work with the young in a compulsory setting need to learn skills of working with a range of other ages in a range of different circumstances, we believe that the problem is more easily manageable, and it must be addressed, than the problem of citizens facing an educational system, the organization of which cannot be understood.

Indeed, we believe that practice has already outstripped the proposals of the Report, as the Report itself acknowledges. School Boards, the major providers of basic education, are already dealing with substantial numbers of adults who, our research evidence indicates, prefer to participate in programs provided by educational agencies they understand. The resurgence of adult participation in School Board programs in the last decade, despite attempts to move all adults to the College programs, is clear evidence of the actual and potential function of the School Boards as providers of educational services with precise objectives to the whole community, rather than only to children in that community. The "linkage" program of vocational education is already attempting to provide continuity in information, aspiration and the acquiring of skill on both sides of the age of sixteen. The North York Board of Education indicates that secondary schools are making arrangements with students for part-time participation and for varieties of "interrupted" education.

In many respects the excessive concern over part-time and full-time participation by the Report is misplaced, a result of the definition. Educationally speaking, the distinction between the "quality" of part-time or full-time participation is disappearing. The actual educational experience of the part-time and full-time student is converging, aided, in the case of the universities, by the adjustment of resources and facilities to varying modes of participation. While the distinction has some meaning for costs, it has and should have increasingly less meaning for administrative purposes, and even less for education. No useful concept of continuing education, in our opinion, would accept this distinction as necessary or appropriate.

Within this perspective, the basic instruments of educational policy are already in place. The elementary and secondary sector provides introductory and advanced or applied basic education; the objectives being the achievement of fundamental skills, the "languages of learning" that are necessary to survive in this society. The definition of those necessary skills will change from time to time. Indeed, a major characteristic of the present period is massive pressure to reform the concept of basic skills. The major change to be brought about, in addition, is the recognition that this sector can and should provide the opportunity to learn these skills for everyone in the community, young or old, who needs them. This sector is the only educational sector with immediate political responsibility to its community, and for that reason must be responsible for the basic skills of citizenship. The Colleges are responsible for advanced skills and knowledge of an immediate and practical kind with direct access to many types of employment. They are already experienced in dealing with a great variety of student-roles, and mixtures of financial support. What should take place in this sector is an elimination of internal distinctions between student-roles, part-time and full-time, continuing education, post-secondary, manpower, etc. The only distinction necessary is one of specialization of program and student ability. The universities are devoted to research and advanced education of a professional kind. While the universities have made considerable progress in removing distinctions between part-time and full-time study, much more legitimacy needs to be attached to their responsibility for students of varying ages, and to their making ease of participation greater, not in terms of academic ability, since that is a question ultimately of priority, but in terms of flexible patterns of study. Both the latter two agencies are becoming life-time resources for some sectors of the population, and they should be encouraged to do so.

This perspective on "continuing education" allows a clarity with respect to public policy, since that policy becomes a matter of determining priorities in terms of educational objectives. Who needs to learn what, and with what urgency. With these priorities set, appropriate existing agencies, or perhaps special short or long-term new ones are assigned, with equally appropriate resources to meet those objectives (a recent example would be the creation of the Ontario Educational Communications Authority). The priorities would include the kind of educational structure required, including the degree of independence or self-determination that each agency should have in order to respond to local or regional needs, and to experiment with emerging priorities. Also included

would be procedures related to decision-making about the determination of short-term priorities, for example, the rights and responsibilities of various agencies to take part in the setting of priorities.

Priorities would naturally be of a long and short-term character. Obviously, those related to structure are of a long-term nature. Those related to the maintenance of programs leading to certification, or as currently termed, "credit programs", are also of a long-term variety, since they presumably represent the most enduring and important educational objectives of the society. Studies that do not lead to certification will reflect more short-term priorities and will be subject to greater local and individual determination, with varying mixtures of financial participation. Much of this procedure already takes place, but it is hampered by outdated concepts of who is the legitimate body of learners and students, concepts held not only by officials of government but by many of those working in the various agencies. We cannot overestimate the importance of accepting the concept that all citizens of all ages are learners, and potential students, and that what they have or have not learned is of the utmost significance to them and to the society. We repeat that the overriding question of policy formation is who needs to learn what and with what degree of urgency, rather than what best suits one providing agency or another. The latter decision is, in essence, a technical decision arising from the question of the best means of achieving the fundamental learning objectives. For example, the decision to provide funds to labour organizations or employers in order to reach learning objectives related to employable skills is a decision not to provide funds to educational providing agencies to achieve the same objectives. It represents a decision of considerable political and economic, and educational significance, but it is a second-order decision made only after the objectives and the appropriate population have been designated.

There are other examples of the operation of such priorities, and of the failure to implement them. In the Winter of 1981, in Metropolitan Toronto, there were over 200 offerings with respect to learning English as a Second Language.[4] They were available in schools, union halls, church basements, recreation centers and other locations. These opportunities were more widely

---

4 Metrodoc, Continuing Education Directory, Toronto. 1981

spread among types of agencies than any other opportunity for adult education. Most of them were free of charge to the learner. Clearly, a priority of such significance had been established that no thought had been given to recovering costs from the learners, and there were no evident anxieties about overlap among agencies and locations. It had been established that it was important to reach as many non-English speakers as possible through whatever means at hand. A similar strategy is to be found in the account in the Report of the British campaign for literacy.

In contrast, it appears that despite the much heralded concern over the decline in numbers of skilled workers in Ontario, that the provision of opportunity to enter those trades by means of part-time studies had been declining steadily throughout the 1970's for example, in Metropolitan Toronto. A large potential group of students, those who had to work full-time to support families, was being steadily cut off from this opportunity.[5]

We believe that the concept of continuing education we are recommending would allow for the establishment of short and long-term priorities with varying degrees of urgency more easily, and would prevent the misapplication of resources reflected in the previous example. It would allow maximum freedom on the part of the learner, and on the part of the providing agency, with respect to the most effective means of accomplishing the particular learning towards the objective established on some regular basis by the government. It would also allow for experimentation with, and commentary on, those objectives by the agencies and the learners, a vital component in the evolution of public goals.

An important additional characteristic of such perspective is that the freedom of entry, and re-entry, indeed the necessity for such participation will contribute fundamentally to the horizontal integration of the educational systems(s) with the learning taking place in the rest of the society. Students of varying ages will bring varying achievements with them, and will force the educational agencies to adjust to that learning in order to meet their more explicit, formal goals. Not only will the external learning be enriched and

---

5 Colour of a Great City. Report of Explorations of Ten Years of Metrodoc, OISE, Toronto. 1980 (Unpublished)

enlarged in significance, but the agencies will be stimulated and invigorated through having to cope with it. In other words, the major task of the formal agencies then becomes one of helping individuals learn "how to learn", and to evaluate the learning they participate in outside the formal agencies.

The first test of any definition lies with whether it fits existing reality with some degree of accuracy, and whether it provides a productive basis for the development of policy. We believe that our perspective of continuing education meets that test, and rather than being an additional "system", provides a means of defining the entire educational endeavour of the province. In addition, we believe that it provides an "image" of the learner that reflects both the actual and the ideal, and allows for a rational grasp of the relationships between the educational endeavour and the entire scope of the learning that is taking place and must take place in the Province, and in all of Canadian society. It is a perspective of an educational enterprise striving to be realized.

Some Specific Commentary on Issues

Issue 1: Definition of Continuing Education
Issue 2: Government Commitment

We believe that we have addressed those issues by providing an alternative definition. In addition, we are implying that the questions addressed by (2) are not issues in fact. The Province does not have these choices since, for some, a system of continuing education as we have defined it already exists. The only choice before the Province is first to elaborate a strategy for learning, and second, to make the existing system(s) of continuing education efficient and just for all of the citizens.

Issue 3: Adult Basic Education

Issue (3) is addressed not to a matter of definition, but to a matter of priority to be decided on the basis of the definition. The fact that this is presented as an issue or as a priority to be determined is the best evidence possible that the existing system is neither efficient nor just. The suggestions for implementing such a priority are sound suggestions, but will only make sense if they are imbedded in the concept we propose. However, we do not believe that adult basic education is necessarily "the first priority" of such a concept in operation. It is true that existing resources for adult education

and the education of children are utilized predominantly by those who seem already to have most of the advantages in this society. However, when speaking of the adults, it is necessary to recognize that these adults occupy positions of responsibility in this society. To an increasing degree we are all dependent upon the degree to which they discharge those responsibilities effectively, and to do this they must continually engage in learning. Both sets of needs are legitimate, the latter need more attention than they have been getting in this Province. To put their freedom of access to learning resources on a competitive basis with the obvious needs of the disadvantaged would be the greatest folly.

Issue 4: Decentralized Co-ordination of Continuing Education

It might be noted that the original recommendation for Community Councils came from the Report of the Select Committee of the Ontario Legislature on the Utilization of Educational Resources. As we pointed out, that body was the only one since the War to accept responsibility for reviewing the entire educational system, instead of one vertical slice, and for that reason developed a powerful sense of the need for local coordination of those resources. The Province has accepted the value of local coordination for other purposes bordering on education, such as the existing Local Employment Councils. An evaluation of their success would perhaps prove to be useful in considering these more inclusive bodies. We believe there are many influences at the moment supporting the growth of interest in local or district determination, of which the price of gasoline is only one. However, the power of individual providing agencies is so great that we are convinced that unless such councils have some formal mandate, or at least some human and financial resources, they cannot hope to accomplish very much.

Issue 5: Leadership Role
Issue 6: Clarification of Roles and Mandates, Etc.

Again, we believe in advocating a "strategy" for learning and thus, for education, we have dealt directly with these issues. Clearly, a strategy for learning must involve more Ministries than the Ministry of Education. We do not believe that appropriate policy can be limited to one piece of legislation, nor to anything but the most broadly based inter-ministry cooperative body within the government. The government has experience with this sort of body

arising from the Manpower Training Committee of a few years ago. The committee should be concerned with the determination of learning objectives, which would then be implemented by various Ministries, with the most explicit implementation in the hands of the Ministry of Education.

We also believe that there is a need for an independent body, resembling the Economic Council of Canada, to perform two principal functions. The first would be to provide information, province-wide, regarding all of the educational opportunities available. As the Report points out, there are systems in place, at least at the "wholesale" level, with experience and expertise in providing this service. Some integration of their techniques and experience would be desireable. The system(s) of continuing education even now in existence are too rich and complicated in their activities to be entrusted entirely to providing agencies.

The second task of this council would be the requirement to report publicly on an annual basis on the degree to which the existing provisions were meeting the objectives established by the Province, to report on developing objectives as they are reflected in demands for and experiments with learning and educational objectives, and to provide this advice to the inter-ministerial committee and the Province as a whole.

Issues 7 to 16

Issues (7) to (16) are means of carrying our learning and educational objectives. Until those objectives are determined, and a system for allowing for their sustained development, determination, and clarification is in place, it is difficult to comment on the particular issues. All the agencies included are valuable, and important additions to the educational life of the Province, but their purposes and functions should not be determined in terms of their institutional interests and needs, rather in terms of the educational and learning objectives desired.

Issues 17 to 21

Issues (17) to (21) are not all real issues. We have argued that some of them, such as educational distinctions between part-time and full-time study, are not useful issues to discuss. The vast bulk of government legislation will

have some implications for learning, and these implications ought to be carefully considered both by the government and the public in their presentation. By implication, all educational legislation will directly affect "continuing education" as we have defined it and as we believe it is emerging in this Province. Some existing legislation, such as the Education Act, needs to be examined in the light of this concept.

To repeat, we believe that the basic instruments for continuing education are in place in the Province. But their mere existence will not allow the smooth and successful attainment of learning and educational objectives alone. There must be a unifying concept and a deliberate strategy for continually adjusting the educational means that each agency can provide to the need for achieving individual and collective objectives for learning that will contribute both to the survival and the well-being of the Province and its people. To put it simply, it is an age in which learning is predominant and we must be able to respond to that reality.